



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/736,055	12/13/2000	Steven W. Lopez	00-P-23062A	6587

7590 02/07/2005

JEFFERY S. WHITE
ALLEN,DYER,DOPPELT,MILBRATH & GILCHRIST
255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE SUITE 1401
P.O.BOX 3791
ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791

EXAMINER

COSIMANO, EDWARD R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3629

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/736,055

Applicant(s)

LOPEZ, STEVEN W.

Examiner

Edward R. Cosimano

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/13/01;9/12/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: PTO-1449 12/20/04.

Art Unit: 3629

1. Applicant should note the changes to patent practice and procedure:
 - A) effective December 01, 1997 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 62, No. 197, Friday October 10, 1997;
 - B) effective November 07, 2000 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 65, No. 54603, September 08, 2000; and
 - C) Amendment in revised format, Vol. 1267 of the Official Gazette published February 25, 2003.
2. Applicant's claim for the benefit of an earlier filing data under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) is acknowledged.
3. The drawings are objected to because
 - A) the following errors have been noted in the drawings:
 - (1) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description, note:
 - (a) reference legends 11 & 30 as disclosed in the paragraphs located:
 - (1) between page 13, line 23, and page 14, line 29, "The system 10 preferably includes a mailpiece feeder 11 that ... from the mailpiece feeder 11 each of the ... and retrieved in subsequent processing steps.";
 - (2) at page 16, lines 13-21, "This embodiment of the system 10 can also include a mailpiece stacker 30 that is positioned downstream ... delivery or be subjected to additional processing.";
 - (3) between page 32, line 16, and page 33, line 16, "FIGS. 11-12 illustrate the preferred elements of the system 10 according to the present invention. In addition to the mailpiece feeder 11, mailpiece transporter 20, mailpiece labeler 28, mailpiece stacker 30, and process controller 16 ... substantially to

the return address indicator 72 as it appears positioned on the mailpiece (FIG. 16).”;

(4) at page 35, lines 10-25, “To accommodate margin-bound ... the feeder 11 preferably ... commonly used for preprinted return addresses on mailpieces.”.

(c) reference legend 97 as disclosed in the paragraph located between page 17, line 17, and page 18, line 29, “Mailpieces to be returned to sender ... by a key punch operator at a video display terminal and keyboard 97, and stored for subsequent mailpiece processing. In ... by keypunch operators using video display terminals.”.

(d) reference legends 14 & 15 as disclosed in the paragraph located at page 35, lines 10-25, “To accommodate margin-bound ... vertical pinch belts 15, each movably mounted on a plurality of mechanically driven rollers 14 and ... preprinted return addresses on mailpieces.”.

(e) reference legend 22 as disclosed in the paragraph located between page 38, line 9, and page 39, line 23, “FIG. 12 perhaps best illustrates an apparatus according ... a mailpiece conveyor 22 to convey each of a plurality of mailpieces along a predetermined path of travel 21; ... corresponding sender return address indicator 74 along with a reason for return indicator.”.

(2) as can be seen in fig. 12 and from the context of the disclosure in the paragraph located at page 15, lines 8-29, “The embodiment moreover further includes a process controller ... corresponding forwarding address indicator 84 (see FIG. 9). The predetermined list of forwarding addresses is preferably a database 701 of forwarding address indicators in communication with the forwarding address determiner 17 of the process controller 16.”, in fig. 11, “707” should be -701--, note also the description of fig. 4 between pages 24-25, which mentions “a database of addresses 701”.

Art Unit: 3629

(3) as can be seen in fig. 1 and from the context of the disclosure in the paragraph between page 20, line 20, and page 21, line 12, "If it is determined that there ... a determination is made whether the mailpiece is to be processed for a return to sender (Block 114). If so, the mailpiece is then submitted for return-to-sender (RTS) processing (Block 115). Preferably, ... returned for subsequent RTS processing, as described below.", fig. 1 lacks the "Y" legend for the path between boxes 114 & 115 and fig. 1 lacks the "N" legend for the path between boxes 114 & 116.

(4) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description, note:

(a) reference legends 112 & 116 of fig. 1 as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 18 and 21.

(b) reference legends 205, 208, 214 & 217 of fig. 2 as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 21 and 23.

(c) reference legends 506, 510 & 511 of fig. 5 as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 27 and 28.

(d) reference legends 617, 621 & 622 of fig. 6 as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 29 and 32.

(e) reference legends 12 & 52 of fig. 12.

(f) reference legends 60 & 75 of fig. 7.

(g) reference legends 70 & 75 of fig. 8.

(h) reference legend 80 of fig. 9.

(5) as can be seen in fig. 2 and from the context of the disclosure in the paragraphs between page 21, line 13, and page 23, line 2, "FIG. 2 illustrates ... Subsequent processing (Block 216).", fig. 2:

(1) lacks the "Y" legend for the path between boxes 209 & 210;

(2) lacks the "N" legend for the path between boxes 209 & 215;

and

(3) does not have a one to one correspondence between what is depicted in fig. 2 and the corresponding description.

(6) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters “2111” and “217” have both been used to designate the box entitled “Select Reason for RTS”.

(7) as can be seen in fig. 3 and from the context of the disclosure in the paragraph at page 23, lines 3-26, “FIG. 3 illustrates the subsequent RTS second pass ... (Block 306). If the entire plurality of mailpieces has been processed (Block 307), then the procedure concludes with an end report being generated (Block 308).”, fig. 3 lacks the “Y” legend for the path between boxes 307 & 308, and the “N” legend for the path between boxes 307 & 302.

(8) as can be seen in fig. 5 and from the context of the disclosure in the paragraph between page 27 and page 28, “FIG. 5 illustrates ... such as the USPS “ZIP + 4.”, fig. 5:

- (1) lacks the “Y” legend for the path between boxes 503 & 504;
- (2) lacks the “N” legend for the path between boxes 503 & 505;
- (3) lacks the “Y” legend for the path between boxes 507 & 508;

and

- (4) lacks the “N” legend for the path between boxes 507 & 509.

(9) as can be seen in fig. 6 and from the context of the disclosure in the paragraph between page 29 and page 32, “The present invention ... any other localized or global communications network.”, fig. 6:

- (1) lacks the “Y” legend for the path between boxes 610 & 611;
- (2) lacks the “N” legend for the path between boxes 610 & 606;
- (3) does not have a one to one correspondence between what is depicted in fig. 6 and the corresponding description;

- (4) lacks the “Y” legend for the path between boxes 622 & 618;

and

- (5) lacks the “N” legend for the path between boxes 622 & 612.

Art Unit: 3629

3.1 Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A) as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(p(5)) and 37 CFR § 1.121(e) the specification lacks an explicit reference to the nature of:

(1) reference legend(s):

(a) reference legends 112 & 116 of fig. 1 as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 18 and 21;

(b) reference legends 205, 208, 214 & 217 of fig. 2 as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 21 and 23;

(c) reference legends 506, 510 & 511 of fig. 5 as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 27 and 28;

(d) reference legends 617, 621 & 622 of fig. 6 as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 29 and 32;

(e) reference legends 12 & 52 of fig. 12;

(f) reference legends 60 & 75 of fig. 7;

(g) reference legends 70 & 75 of fig. 8; and

(h) reference legend 80 of fig. 9;

(2) how the program proceeds after box(es):

(a) 110 & 114 of fig. 1 if the inquiry is “NO” as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 18 and 21;

(b) 209 of fig. 2 if the inquiry is “NO” as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 21 and 23;

(c) 307 of fig. 3 if the inquiry is “NO” as disclosed in the paragraph located at page 23, lines 3-26, “FIG. 3 illustrates the subsequent RTS second pass ... (Block 306). If the entire plurality of mailpieces has been processed (Block 307), then the procedure concludes with an end report being generated (Block 308).”;

(d) 406 & 410 of fig. 4 if the inquiry is “NO” as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 24 and 26;

(e) 404 of fig. 4 if the inquiry is “YES” as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 24 and 26;

(f) 508 of fig. 5 if the inquiry is either “YES” or “NO” as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 27 and 28;

(g) 604 & 610 of fig. 6 if the inquiry is “NO” as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 29 and 32;

(h) 615 of fig. 6 if the inquiry is “YES” as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 29 and 32; and

(i) 621 & 622 of fig. 6 if the inquiry is either “YES” or “NO” as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 29 and 32.

In this regard, it is noted that merely mentioning either a feature or a number with out mentioning the device or operation or number or feature relies on the drawing to provide support for the disclosure and not to aid in the understanding of the invention, as is the purpose of the drawings (37 CFR § 1.81(a,b)).

B) the subject matter of:

(1) claim 10 and the reference to a “fixed speed motor”, since neither a “fixed” of “variable” speed motor has not disclosed;

Art Unit: 3629

(2) claim 11 and the use of adjustable stackers, since the disclosure does not make any reference to the stacker being adjustable;

(3) claim 12 and the use of a "vacuum assistor", since the disclosure does not make any reference to a "vacuum assistor"; and

(4) claim 13 and reference to a speed of "35 inches per second" since the disclosure does not make any reference to a particular speed;

and hence lacks antecedent basis within the specification as required by 37 CFR § 1.75(d1).

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The specification and drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification or drawings. Applicant should note the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.52, 37 CFR § 1.74, § 1.75, § 1.84(o,p(5)), § 1.121(a)-1.121(f) & § 1.121(h)-1.121(i).

6. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6.1 In regard to claims 1-47, although one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention would know how to accomplish each of the individual recited actions/functions from the language of these claims, since, there is no clear and definite interconnection between one or more of the recited limitations of these claims, one of ordinary skill could not determine from the language of these claims whether or not they are in fact making and/or using the claimed invention. In this regard it is noted that from the language of these claims it is vague, indefinite and unclear:

A) in regard to claims 1, 20, 31, and when and why the "return-to-sender determiner" is "responsive to the sender return address indication data group" "to determine when a corresponding mailpiece is to be returned to sender and thereby instruct the labeler to label the mailpiece with the corresponding return address indicator", would return the mail piece to the sender, since as disclose the pieces of

mail that are to be returned to the sender are pieces of mail that can not be delivered as addressed and would not incur to great of an additional cost.

B) in regard to claim 1, and why the “sender notification determiner” is “responsive to the sender notification indicator data group of each of the plurality of mailpieces to determine when to generate a sender notice”, since as disclosed the “sender notice” is generated only if the mail is to be forwarded and the sender has indicated that a notice is requested.

C) in regard to claim 1, and how the limitation of “a mailpiece stacker positioned downstream from the mailpiece transporter to receive each of the plurality of the intermixed mailpieces from the mailpiece transporter and to direct each of the mailpieces to one of a plurality of preselected stacking positions.”, can be carried out, since the invention as recited in this claim does not determine or receive an indication of the “preselected stacking position” that is to receive the mail piece.

D) in regard to claim 5 and what is the nature of the “additional processing” and under what circumstances would “additional processing” required, since the invention as recited in this claim does not perform any processing so that “additional processing” maybe required.

E) in regard to claim 10, and how a “fixed speed motor” can drive the conveyor at two different speeds depending on the type of mail.

F) in regard to claim 15, and how a “postage due notice” can appear on the item of mail, since the invention as recited in this claim does not determine or receive an indication of the “postage due” so that the “postage due” may be indicated on the mail piece.

G) in regard to claims 26, 46 and why an “indicia” is printed on “a selected indicia carrier”, since the invention as recited in this claim does not determine or receive an indication of the “indicia” so that the “indicia” may be printed.

H) in regard to claim 32 and under what circumstance would an item require reprocessing so that it may be coded as required by this claims, since the invention as

Art Unit: 3629

recited in this claim does not perform any processing so that "reprocessing processing" maybe required.

6.2 In regard to claim 16, since claim 1 fails to recite the use of a "label", applicant's reference to printing on a label in this claim is confusing.

6.3 The subject matter of:

A) claim 10 and the reference to a "fixed speed motor", since neither a "fixed" of "variable" speed motor has not disclosed;

B) claim 11 and the use of adjustable stackers, since the disclosure does not make any reference to the stacker being adjustable;

C) claim 12 and the use of a "vacuum assistor", since the disclosure does not make any reference to a "vacuum assistor"; and

D) claim 13 and reference to a speed of "35 inches per second" since the disclosure does not make any reference to a particular speed;

and hence lacks antecedent basis within the specification as required by 37 CFR § 1.75(d1).

6.4 Claims not specifically mentioned above, inherit the defects of the base claim through dependency. For the above reason(s), applicant has failed to particularly point out what is regarded as the invention.

7. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

7.1 Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

7.1.1 As set forth by the Court in:

A) In re Musgrave 167 USPQ 280 at 289-290 (CCPA 1970), "We cannot agree with the Board that these claims (all the steps of which can be carried out by the disclosed apparatus) are directed to non-statutory processes merely because some or all of the steps therein can also be carried out in or with the aid of the human mind or because it may be necessary for one performing

Art Unit: 3629

the process to think. All that is necessary, in our view, to make a sequence of operational steps a statutory "process" within 35 U.S.C. 101 is that it be in the technological arts so as to be in consonance with the Constitutional purpose to promote the progress of "useful arts." Cons. Art. 1, sec. 8.", {emphasis added}; and

B) In re Sarkar 100 USPQ 132 @ 136-137 (CCPA 1978), echoing the Board of Appeals stated in regard to claim 14 "14. A method of locating an obstruction in an open channel to affect flow in a predetermined manner comprising:

a) obtaining the dimensions of said obstruction which affect the parameters of flow;

b) constructing a mathematical model of at least that portion of the open channel in which said obstruction is to be located in accordance with the method of claim 1 using those dimensions obtained in step (a) above;

c) adjusting the location of said obstruction within said mathematical model until the desired effect upon flow is obtained in said model; and thereafter

d) constructing said obstruction within the actual open channel at the specified adjusted location indicated by the mathematical model.";

and "Concerning claims 14-39 and the significance of "post-solution activity," like building a bridge or dam, the board concluded: While it is true that the final step in each of these claims makes reference to the mathematical result achieved by performing the prior recited steps, we consider the connection to be so tenuous that the several steps recited in each claim when considered as a whole do not constitute a proper method under the statute.", {emphasis added}.

7.1.2 Further, it is noted in regard to claims 14-39 of Sarkar, although step (d) of claim 14 of Sarkar references the result of step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar it is clear from the language of step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar that multiple adjustments to the location of the obstruction are

Art Unit: 3629

required to be made until a location with the desired effect has been determined. Hence, the reference to constructing the obstruction at the “specified adjusted location” in step (d) of claim 14 of Sarkar is vague, indefinite and unclear in regard to which one of the possible multiple adjusted locations of the obstruction that were used during step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar would be used when constructing the obstruction as required by step (d) of Sarkar. Therefore, without a clear connection between step (d) of Sarkar and the remaining steps of claim 14 of Sarkar, the Board of Appeals and the Court held that these claims were not a process within the meaning of process as used in 35 U.S.C. § 101 and hence were directed to non-statutory subject matter.

7.1.3 As can be seen from claims 1-47, these claims are directed to a series of devices for performing various functions or steps/actions/functions, which as set forth above in regard to the rejection of claims 1-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 2nd paragraph, are not clearly and definitely interconnected to one another and therefore do not provide an operative useful machine/system or method/process within the meaning of machine or process as used in 35 U.S.C. § 101.

7.2 Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter, since:

A) in regard to claims 1-47, these claims fail to comply with the “requirements this title, namely 35 U.S.C. § 112 2nd paragraph as set forth above.

B) in regard to claims {fill in}, these claims fail to comply with the “requirements this title, namely 35 U.S.C. § 102 as set forth below.

C) in regard to claims {fill in}, these claims fail to comply with the “requirements this title, namely 35 U.S.C. § 103 as set forth below.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(c) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

8.1 Claims 1-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art, see page 2, line 16, through page 5, line 19, "Most mail handling services ... individual envelopes for sending to the original sender" in view In re Venner and Bowser, 120 U.S.P.Q. 192 @ 194 (CCPA, 1958).

8.1.1 In regard to claims 1, 10, 16-20, 31-35 & 48-55, applicant admitted prior art includes a mail processing system in which a feed feeds mail to a constant speed conveyor which transports the item of mail past a scanner. Under the control of a central control device, the scanner scans the address information on the item of mail to determine a routing code and then applies the determined routing code to the item of mail. The applied routing code is then used to direct the item of mail to its final destination. It is noted that if an address has associated forwarding information, then the applied routing code is would be based on forwarding information supplied for the particular address. Further these systems include a process where undeliverable mail is either returned to the sender or the sender is appropriately notified that an item of mail can not be delivered; and the sender is notified of forwarding information.

8.1.2 It is noted that as described by applicant the mail processing systems of the prior art manually performed many of the above tasks, however, since the replacement of manual activity by automatic activity that provides the same result is not invention, for as the Court has stated it is not invention to broadly replace manual activity with an automatic activity that accomplishes the same result, (In re Venner and Bowser, 120 U.S.P.Q. 192 @ 194 (CCPA, 1958)). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention that the activities performed by the mail processing systems of the prior art could be replaced by devices that would perform these tasks in an automation function.

Art Unit: 3629

8.1.3 In regard to claims 2-7, 15, 21-29 & 37-47, since the prior art systems require the item of mail to be scanned, the scanned information converted into recognizable characters, and the used of the recognized characters to generate a routing code that is to be applied to an item of mail, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention that any suitable arrangement of devices that could scan, convert the scanned information, and used the converted scanned information to generate and apply a routing code could be used absent applicant's showing of new and unexpected results from using a particular arrangement of devices.

8.1.4 In regard to claims 8-9, it is noted that the proper operation of the systems of the prior art would require the storage of information for latter use, since it takes a period of time to perform any one of the required tasks.

8.1.5 In regard to the adjustments of claim 11; or the physical structure of claim 12; or the speed of claim 13; or the resolution of claim 14; or the image sizing of claims 15 & 36; or the image re-orientation of claim 30, since the prior art systems require stackers to receive mail of mixed sizes that has been transported by a conveyor past a scanner so that it may be recognized and placed on a label of fixed size, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention that any suitable arrangement of devices that could perform the required operations could be used absent applicant's showing of new and unexpected results from using a particular arrangement of devices.

9. Applicant must supply the prior art mentioned in the paragraph:

A) located between page 18, line 117, and page 19, line 27, "FIG. 1 illustrates, in perhaps greater detail, the method 100 of the present invention ... (Block 107). Again, in the context of domestic United States mail handling, the USPS has instituted the Address Change Service ("ACS") whereby a mailer may include on the mailpiece a USPS-approved message above the receiver location address requesting the service to notify the mailer when a mailpiece is forwarded (See USPS Publication 8, at pages 9-13). Thus, ... notification indicator 74 was present on the mailpiece being processed."

10. The examiner has cited prior art of interest, for example:

A) Heaney et al (3,368,672) which discloses a sorting system that includes a feeder, conveyor, operator manual input station and a control system that will encode operator entered information and then label/print/apply the coded information to the item so that the coded information may be detected/scanned and used to direct/sort an item of mail based on coded information.

B) Rosenberg et al (3,420,368) which discloses a sorting system that includes a feeder, conveyor, scanning station and a control system that will direct an item of mail to a destination bin/stack based on coded information that is detected by the scanning station.

C) Handy et al (4,832,204) which discloses a sorting system that includes a feeder, conveyor, scanning station and a control system that will direct an item of mail to a destination bin/stack based on coded information that is detected by the scanning station.

D) Yamada et al (JP 04-185067) which disclose that messages that can not be delivered to a destination address are stored and then forwarded to a new corrected destination address when a corrected destination address is found.

E) the PR newswire article discloses that upon the detection of a condition the sender, recipient and operator are notified that the condition has occurred.

F) either Isaacs et al (6,401,936 or 6,484,886) which discloses a sorting system that includes a feeder, conveyor, scanning input station and a control system that will scan destination information on the item of mail, encode the destination information and then label/print/apply the coded information to the item so that the coded information may be detected/scanned and used to direct/sort an item of mail based on coded information.

G) Feick (6,435,404) discloses the scanning of both the destination and sender information provided on an item of mail.

11. The shorten statutory period of response is set to expire 3 (three) months from the mailing date of this Office action.

Art Unit: 3629


12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (703) 305-9783. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (703)-308-2702. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

12.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL/DRAFT FAXES is (703) 746-7240.

12.2 The fax phone number for OFFICIAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

12.3 The fax phone number for AFTER FINAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

02/01/05


Edward R. Cosimano
Primary Examiner A.U. 3629